

WEEKLY JOURNAL.

UNION STATE CONVENTION.

The majority of the Central Committee appointed by the Union Convention of the State of Kentucky, held in Louisville on the 15th March, 1863, considered their duty, and right to call another Convention: Wherefore, it is resolved that the votes of the Central Committee, and the plenum adopted by the Union Democratic Convention held in the city of Louisville on the 18th of March last, and who desire to carry out their objects, shall call a Convention to be held in the said city on 25th of May next, for the purpose of forming a State electoral-ticket, and selecting delegates to the National Convention which meets in the city of Cincinnati on the 1st of July next.

JAMES GUTHRIE, Chairman.
G. D. PRENTICE,
R. KNIGHT,
GEO. P. DOOR,
HAMILTON POPE.

THURSDAY, MAY 5, 1864.

50 The New York Times, in beginning a very extravagant eulogy upon Mr. Lincoln's letter to the Gov. Bramlette, who had previously seriously contemplated organized resistance to the enlistment of colored troops in Kentucky, was compelled to admit that he had been a traitor, and from that time forward gave the President his confidence and support. It could not but satisfy any reasonable loyal man, however, that the subject of the letter was a traitor.

The Times commits two very great errors here. Governor Bramlette never contemplated unlawful resistance to the enforcement of the enrollment law; and the views and sentiments repeated by Mr. Lincoln in this letter effected no change whatever in the views and sentiments of Governor Bramlette, who returned from Washington, as he went, a stanch and earnest conservative, and who now gives Mr. Lincoln no less and no greater confidence and support than the bulk of the Conservative Unionists of Kentucky give him. Mr. Lincoln treated Governor Bramlette with courtesy, said that the people of Kentucky should be subjected to no wrong and annoyances outside of the enrollment law and the other laws concerning negroes, and that he would do his best upon Kentucky to see that which could be fairly claimed under the existing law.

Mr. Governor Bramlette very cautiously, in response to the application of Mr. Hodge. And this is the whole of it.

The question of the lawfulness and policy of the laws themselves was not raised or discussed by Governor Bramlette, as most assuredly his opinion on the question remains perfectly unchanged. He is, we repeat, a stanch and earnest conservative, and is consequently the adversary and not the apologist of Mr. Lincoln as a party chief. The manufacturers of public sentiment in Mr. Lincoln's behalf are getting to be so extremely keen that one can hardly speak of the President with civility without being forthwith enrolled as his follower. We look upon the indication as a very cheering one, ridiculous as it is in itself, since the demand must be pressing when the supply is sought with such assiduity.

50 Some of the abolition journals are quoting Jefferson's letter to Colvin, with the view of screening or softening the enormity of Mr. Lincoln's doctrine that whatever the executive deems indispensable is lawful. It could be fairly established that Jefferson ever asserted this doctrine, the result would surely have been, without removing the spot from Mr. Lincoln's; for the doctrine, manifestly subversive of all constitutional government, cannot be enunciated by any name, however bright and grand. The result would be to make the worse for Jefferson and none the better for Lincoln. But the result cannot be fairly established.

The letter to Colvin is quoted by the journal in question as follows:

The question you propose, whether circumstances do not sometimes occur which make it duty in officers of high trust to assume authority beyond the law, the law of necessity is principle, not consequence, of the practice. A strict observance of the written law is doubtless one of the high duties of a good man; but not the highest. The law of necessity, when we are in danger, is of higher obligation. To lose our country by a scrupulous adherence to it, would be to lose the law itself, with life, liberty, property, and all those who are enjoying them with us; thus surely sacrificing the end to the means.

General Washington's army was anxious from Chev's letter, he did not hesitate to plant his cannon against it, though he was not in command of the subter, feeling that the property of the army must be protected.

And, for many years, it was what it was.

But the result would be to make the worse for Jefferson and none the better for Lincoln.

The letter to Colvin is quoted by the journal in question as follows:

The question you propose, whether circumstances do not sometimes occur which make it duty in officers of high trust to assume authority beyond the law, the law of necessity is principle, not consequence, of the practice. A strict observance of the written law is doubtless one of the high duties of a good man; but not the highest. The law of necessity, when we are in danger, is of higher obligation. To lose our country by a scrupulous adherence to it, would be to lose the law itself, with life, liberty, property, and all those who are enjoying them with us; thus surely sacrificing the end to the means.

General Washington's army was anxious from Chev's letter, he did not hesitate to plant his cannon against it, though he was not in command of the subter, feeling that the property of the army must be protected.

And, for many years, it was what it was.

But the result would be to make the worse for Jefferson and none the better for Lincoln.

The letter to Colvin is quoted by the journal in question as follows:

The question you propose, whether circumstances do not sometimes occur which make it duty in officers of high trust to assume authority beyond the law, the law of necessity is principle, not consequence, of the practice. A strict observance of the written law is doubtless one of the high duties of a good man; but not the highest. The law of necessity, when we are in danger, is of higher obligation. To lose our country by a scrupulous adherence to it, would be to lose the law itself, with life, liberty, property, and all those who are enjoying them with us; thus surely sacrificing the end to the means.

General Washington's army was anxious from Chev's letter, he did not hesitate to plant his cannon against it, though he was not in command of the subter, feeling that the property of the army must be protected.

And, for many years, it was what it was.

But the result would be to make the worse for Jefferson and none the better for Lincoln.

The letter to Colvin is quoted by the journal in question as follows:

The question you propose, whether circumstances do not sometimes occur which make it duty in officers of high trust to assume authority beyond the law, the law of necessity is principle, not consequence, of the practice. A strict observance of the written law is doubtless one of the high duties of a good man; but not the highest. The law of necessity, when we are in danger, is of higher obligation. To lose our country by a scrupulous adherence to it, would be to lose the law itself, with life, liberty, property, and all those who are enjoying them with us; thus surely sacrificing the end to the means.

General Washington's army was anxious from Chev's letter, he did not hesitate to plant his cannon against it, though he was not in command of the subter, feeling that the property of the army must be protected.

And, for many years, it was what it was.

But the result would be to make the worse for Jefferson and none the better for Lincoln.

The letter to Colvin is quoted by the journal in question as follows:

The question you propose, whether circumstances do not sometimes occur which make it duty in officers of high trust to assume authority beyond the law, the law of necessity is principle, not consequence, of the practice. A strict observance of the written law is doubtless one of the high duties of a good man; but not the highest. The law of necessity, when we are in danger, is of higher obligation. To lose our country by a scrupulous adherence to it, would be to lose the law itself, with life, liberty, property, and all those who are enjoying them with us; thus surely sacrificing the end to the means.

General Washington's army was anxious from Chev's letter, he did not hesitate to plant his cannon against it, though he was not in command of the subter, feeling that the property of the army must be protected.

And, for many years, it was what it was.

But the result would be to make the worse for Jefferson and none the better for Lincoln.

The letter to Colvin is quoted by the journal in question as follows:

The question you propose, whether circumstances do not sometimes occur which make it duty in officers of high trust to assume authority beyond the law, the law of necessity is principle, not consequence, of the practice. A strict observance of the written law is doubtless one of the high duties of a good man; but not the highest. The law of necessity, when we are in danger, is of higher obligation. To lose our country by a scrupulous adherence to it, would be to lose the law itself, with life, liberty, property, and all those who are enjoying them with us; thus surely sacrificing the end to the means.

General Washington's army was anxious from Chev's letter, he did not hesitate to plant his cannon against it, though he was not in command of the subter, feeling that the property of the army must be protected.

And, for many years, it was what it was.

But the result would be to make the worse for Jefferson and none the better for Lincoln.

The letter to Colvin is quoted by the journal in question as follows:

The question you propose, whether circumstances do not sometimes occur which make it duty in officers of high trust to assume authority beyond the law, the law of necessity is principle, not consequence, of the practice. A strict observance of the written law is doubtless one of the high duties of a good man; but not the highest. The law of necessity, when we are in danger, is of higher obligation. To lose our country by a scrupulous adherence to it, would be to lose the law itself, with life, liberty, property, and all those who are enjoying them with us; thus surely sacrificing the end to the means.

General Washington's army was anxious from Chev's letter, he did not hesitate to plant his cannon against it, though he was not in command of the subter, feeling that the property of the army must be protected.

And, for many years, it was what it was.

But the result would be to make the worse for Jefferson and none the better for Lincoln.

The letter to Colvin is quoted by the journal in question as follows:

The question you propose, whether circumstances do not sometimes occur which make it duty in officers of high trust to assume authority beyond the law, the law of necessity is principle, not consequence, of the practice. A strict observance of the written law is doubtless one of the high duties of a good man; but not the highest. The law of necessity, when we are in danger, is of higher obligation. To lose our country by a scrupulous adherence to it, would be to lose the law itself, with life, liberty, property, and all those who are enjoying them with us; thus surely sacrificing the end to the means.

General Washington's army was anxious from Chev's letter, he did not hesitate to plant his cannon against it, though he was not in command of the subter, feeling that the property of the army must be protected.

And, for many years, it was what it was.

But the result would be to make the worse for Jefferson and none the better for Lincoln.

The letter to Colvin is quoted by the journal in question as follows:

The question you propose, whether circumstances do not sometimes occur which make it duty in officers of high trust to assume authority beyond the law, the law of necessity is principle, not consequence, of the practice. A strict observance of the written law is doubtless one of the high duties of a good man; but not the highest. The law of necessity, when we are in danger, is of higher obligation. To lose our country by a scrupulous adherence to it, would be to lose the law itself, with life, liberty, property, and all those who are enjoying them with us; thus surely sacrificing the end to the means.

General Washington's army was anxious from Chev's letter, he did not hesitate to plant his cannon against it, though he was not in command of the subter, feeling that the property of the army must be protected.

And, for many years, it was what it was.

But the result would be to make the worse for Jefferson and none the better for Lincoln.

The letter to Colvin is quoted by the journal in question as follows:

The question you propose, whether circumstances do not sometimes occur which make it duty in officers of high trust to assume authority beyond the law, the law of necessity is principle, not consequence, of the practice. A strict observance of the written law is doubtless one of the high duties of a good man; but not the highest. The law of necessity, when we are in danger, is of higher obligation. To lose our country by a scrupulous adherence to it, would be to lose the law itself, with life, liberty, property, and all those who are enjoying them with us; thus surely sacrificing the end to the means.

General Washington's army was anxious from Chev's letter, he did not hesitate to plant his cannon against it, though he was not in command of the subter, feeling that the property of the army must be protected.

And, for many years, it was what it was.

But the result would be to make the worse for Jefferson and none the better for Lincoln.

The letter to Colvin is quoted by the journal in question as follows:

The question you propose, whether circumstances do not sometimes occur which make it duty in officers of high trust to assume authority beyond the law, the law of necessity is principle, not consequence, of the practice. A strict observance of the written law is doubtless one of the high duties of a good man; but not the highest. The law of necessity, when we are in danger, is of higher obligation. To lose our country by a scrupulous adherence to it, would be to lose the law itself, with life, liberty, property, and all those who are enjoying them with us; thus surely sacrificing the end to the means.

General Washington's army was anxious from Chev's letter, he did not hesitate to plant his cannon against it, though he was not in command of the subter, feeling that the property of the army must be protected.

And, for many years, it was what it was.

But the result would be to make the worse for Jefferson and none the better for Lincoln.

The letter to Colvin is quoted by the journal in question as follows:

The question you propose, whether circumstances do not sometimes occur which make it duty in officers of high trust to assume authority beyond the law, the law of necessity is principle, not consequence, of the practice. A strict observance of the written law is doubtless one of the high duties of a good man; but not the highest. The law of necessity, when we are in danger, is of higher obligation. To lose our country by a scrupulous adherence to it, would be to lose the law itself, with life, liberty, property, and all those who are enjoying them with us; thus surely sacrificing the end to the means.

General Washington's army was anxious from Chev's letter, he did not hesitate to plant his cannon against it, though he was not in command of the subter, feeling that the property of the army must be protected.

And, for many years, it was what it was.

But the result would be to make the worse for Jefferson and none the better for Lincoln.

The letter to Colvin is quoted by the journal in question as follows:

The question you propose, whether circumstances do not sometimes occur which make it duty in officers of high trust to assume authority beyond the law, the law of necessity is principle, not consequence, of the practice. A strict observance of the written law is doubtless one of the high duties of a good man; but not the highest. The law of necessity, when we are in danger, is of higher obligation. To lose our country by a scrupulous adherence to it, would be to lose the law itself, with life, liberty, property, and all those who are enjoying them with us; thus surely sacrificing the end to the means.

General Washington's army was anxious from Chev's letter, he did not hesitate to plant his cannon against it, though he was not in command of the subter, feeling that the property of the army must be protected.

And, for many years, it was what it was.

But the result would be to make the worse for Jefferson and none the better for Lincoln.

The letter to Colvin is quoted by the journal in question as follows:

The question you propose, whether circumstances do not sometimes occur which make it duty in officers of high trust to assume authority beyond the law, the law of necessity is principle, not consequence, of the practice. A strict observance of the written law is doubtless one of the high duties of a good man; but not the highest. The law of necessity, when we are in danger, is of higher obligation. To lose our country by a scrupulous adherence to it, would be to lose the law itself, with life, liberty, property, and all those who are enjoying them with us; thus surely sacrificing the end to the means.

General Washington's army was anxious from Chev's letter, he did not hesitate to plant his cannon against it, though he was not in command of the subter, feeling that the property of the army must be protected.

And, for many years, it was what it was.

But the result would be to make the worse for Jefferson and none the better for Lincoln.

The letter to Colvin is quoted by the journal in question as follows:

The question you propose, whether circumstances do not sometimes occur which make it duty in officers of high trust to assume authority beyond the law, the law of necessity is principle, not consequence, of the practice. A strict observance of the written law is doubtless one of the high duties of a good man; but not the highest. The law of necessity, when we are in danger, is of higher obligation. To lose our country by a scrupulous adherence to it, would be to lose the law itself, with life, liberty, property, and all those who are enjoying them with us; thus surely sacrificing the end to the means.

General Washington's army was anxious from Chev's letter, he did not hesitate to plant his cannon against it, though he was not in command of the subter, feeling that the property of the army must be protected.

And, for many years, it was what it was.

But the result would be to make the worse for Jefferson and none the better for Lincoln.

The letter to Colvin is quoted by the journal in question as follows:

The question you propose, whether circumstances do not sometimes occur which make it duty in officers of high trust to assume authority beyond the law, the law of necessity is principle, not consequence, of the practice. A strict observance of the written law is doubtless one of the high duties of a good man; but not the highest. The law of necessity, when we are in danger, is of higher obligation. To lose our country by a scrupulous adherence to it, would be to lose the law itself, with life, liberty, property, and all those who are enjoying them with us; thus surely sacrificing the end to the means.

General Washington's army was anxious from Chev's letter, he did not hesitate to plant his cannon against it, though he was not in command of the subter, feeling that the property of the army must be protected.

And, for many years, it was what it was.

But the result would be to make the worse for Jefferson and none the better for Lincoln.

The letter to Colvin is quoted by the journal in question as follows:

The question you propose, whether circumstances do not sometimes occur which make it duty in officers of high trust to assume authority beyond the law, the law of necessity is principle, not consequence, of the practice. A strict observance of the written law is doubtless one of the high duties of a good man; but not the highest. The law of necessity, when we are in danger, is of higher obligation. To lose our country by a scrupulous adherence to it, would be to lose the law itself, with life, liberty, property, and all those who are enjoying them with us; thus surely sacrificing the end to the means.

General Washington's army was anxious from Chev's letter, he did not hesitate to plant his cannon against it, though he was not in command of the subter, feeling that the property of the army must be protected.

And, for many years, it was what it was.

But the result would be to make the worse for Jefferson and none the better for Lincoln.

The letter to Colvin is quoted by the journal in question as follows:

The question you propose, whether circumstances do not sometimes occur which make it duty in officers of high trust to assume authority beyond the law, the law of necessity is principle, not consequence, of the practice. A strict observance of the written law is doubtless one of the high duties of a good man; but not the highest. The law of necessity, when we are in danger, is of higher obligation. To lose our country by a scrupulous adherence to it, would be to lose the law itself, with life, liberty, property, and all those who are enjoying them with us; thus surely sacrificing the end to the

heavy earthworks opposite Falouth on 1

Fredericksburg.

Civilians find all the avenues to the army are sealed. Even newspaper correspondents have been stopped in getting to the front.

The House Military Committee, under George L. Foster before them, urged the reconsideration of the military railroad across Eastern Kentucky and Tennessee, also early recommended by the President.

HEADQUARTERS ARMY OF THE POTOMAC. May 4.

An **ex-Confederate** spring campaign is to commence in the following address to the Committee on Military Affairs:

The confidence, patriotic sentiment, and inspiring physiognomy all tend to and do help some to some and assist in the efforts to break men who are soon to march upon the foe.

HEADQUARTERS ARMY OF THE POTOMAC. May 4.

SOURCE: Again you are an army upon to advance on the enemy of your country. The time and occasion are deemed opportune by your commanding General to address an army of 100,000 men.

You have all been reorganized, strengthened, and fully equipped in every respect. You form part of several armies of your country, the whole under the direction of your General, the distinguished General who enjoys the confidence of the Government, the people, and the army. Your movement is in co-operation with others of the Union forces. No effort will be left untried to make it successful.

Soldiers, the eyes of the whole country are looking upon you. The world is shown to you as about to strike in the sacred cause that ever called men to arms. Remember your homes, your wives, and your children, and the love of their country. Your cause is everywhere the cause you will be shown to enjoy the benefits and blessings of peace. Bear with the patriotic hardships and sacrifices that will be made upon you to give you confidence in your leaders, and in each other.

Keep yourselves on the march and on the battle-field, and let each man earnestly seek God's blessing, and endeavor by his thoughts and actions to render himself worthy of the favor he seeks; and with clear consciousness of duty in fighting to preserve the government and institutions handed down to us by our forefathers, and true to ourselves, victory, God's blessing, must and will attend our efforts.

GE. G. MEADE, Maj. Gen'd.

S. WILLIAMS. Washington, May 5.

The rebels are concentrating an immense number of troops in Virginia, but our military leaders protest as perfectly satisfied with the present situation.

All are in agreement with the Army of the Potomac and with the troops for the present.

FORREST MONROE. May 5.

Passengers report that the U. S. C. was laid in ashes by strafing machine and soldiers at the time of evacuation. The Government naval, commissary, ordnance, and medical departments are in full force. The city was mainly owned by Union people.

Four thousand Federal troops suddenly evacuated Washington in the first seven days of April. The Union population to their tender mercies, after burning the houses over their heads.

When the U. S. steamer left the dock, the general and the children and children being abandoned were pitiful.

The indignation against General Butler is very bitter in North Carolina, and a delegation of the people have gone to Washington to ask his removal.

It is said that the rebel bands have decided to make a stand in the Carolinas without waiting for assistance from their army.

We fear that West Point, Virginia, at the head of York river, was occupied by a portion of our forces on Monday, the 1st.

BARNUM, May 5.

Accompanied from Washington, North Carolina, are evidently greatly exaggerated. A letter received from Forrest Monroe that morning says nearly all the rebels from Washington and report that the place was burned last Saturday, probably by guerrillas.

We fear that West Point, Virginia, at the head of York river, was occupied by a portion of our forces on Monday, the 1st.

WASHINGTON, May 5.

The national currency bill came in order, and the Senate proceeded to act upon the amendment.

Mr. Sumner presented a substitute for the committee's amendment to the national bank bill increasing the tax on circulation to one per cent, and reducing the amount invested in and on capital stock, beyond the amount invested in United States bonds, to half of one per cent.

The clause in the bill affecting the Bank of Commerce was, on motion of Mr. Sherman, amended, so as to allow the Comptroller of the Currency to require that no capital shall be less than five millions and its surplus less than twenty per cent.

The Senate adjourned.

THE HOUSE went into committee of the whole on the special order to revise the bill to reimburse Pennsylvania for expenses incurred in carrying out the plan of repulsion.

Mr. Odell, in response to a motion to the section appropriating \$150,000,000 to defray the expenses of calling out volunteers, militia, and the like, and for the payment of other local taxes to Pennsylvania and other local States to repel invasion.

Mr. Garfield said this subject was before the Committee on Military Affairs, who had reported it to the War Department, and that the fact the Committee were still occupying a full report on the various classes of claims.

It was necessary to have all the facts before the Committee, and as such as they appeared, in fear of the 15th of February, increasing the number of rebels to a point sufficient to make the rebellion a certainty.

The clause in the bill affecting the Bank of Commerce was, on motion of Mr. Sherman, amended, so as to allow the Comptroller of the Currency to require that no capital shall be less than five millions and its surplus less than twenty per cent.

The Senate adjourned.

THE HOUSE went into committee of the whole on the special order to revise the bill to reimburse Pennsylvania for expenses incurred in carrying out the plan of repulsion.

Mr. Odell referred to facts to show that the bill was a mistake.

Mr. Smith advanced the following amendment:

That \$100,000 were called out in his State, the shop, and machine works; why should not the same be delayed in their payment?

Mr. H. B. Smith, a member of a committee on a commission to the State Guard of Missouri. They had not been mustered into the service of the United States, but were in the War Department, and the same were not in the War Department, or elsewhere in Washington, any evidence of the number of men in the various classes of men had been cut out, and the same were to be determined as the case arises.

Mr. Garfield replied that the Secretary of War had not been able to furnish papers from all of these States, which is he did not know for all parties.

It is the intention of the Military Committee to introduce a bill providing for the payment of the sum advanced to the various classes of men, and the same were properly apportioned, Congress made an appropriation to cover the amount.

The Committee on Military Affairs proposed to pursue a similar course toward other States.

Mr. King of Missouri, made a few remarks to show that the general was a mistake.

Mr. Odell referred to facts to show that the bill was a mistake.

Mr. Smith advanced the following amendment:

That \$100,000 were called out in his State, the shop, and machine works; why should not the same be delayed in their payment?

Mr. H. B. Smith, a member of a committee on a commission to the State Guard of Missouri. They had not been mustered into the service of the United States, but were in the War Department, and the same were not in the War Department, or elsewhere in Washington, any evidence of the number of men in the various classes of men had been cut out, and the same were to be determined as the case arises.

Mr. Garfield replied that the Secretary of War had not been able to furnish papers from all of these States, which is he did not know for all parties.

It is the intention of the Military Committee to introduce a bill providing for the payment of the sum advanced to the various classes of men, and the same were properly apportioned, Congress made an appropriation to cover the amount.

The Committee on Military Affairs proposed to pursue a similar course toward other States.

Mr. King of Missouri, made a few remarks to show that the general was a mistake.

Mr. Odell referred to facts to show that the bill was a mistake.

Mr. Smith advanced the following amendment:

That \$100,000 were called out in his State, the shop, and machine works; why should not the same be delayed in their payment?

Mr. H. B. Smith, a member of a committee on a commission to the State Guard of Missouri. They had not been mustered into the service of the United States, but were in the War Department, and the same were not in the War Department, or elsewhere in Washington, any evidence of the number of men in the various classes of men had been cut out, and the same were to be determined as the case arises.

Mr. Garfield opposed the bill, and said that it would be better to appoint a commission to ascertain the amount of the claims of all the States, and then have them up piecemeal, and in future to make an appropriation for their payment.

Mr. H. B. Smith, a member of a committee on a commission to the State Guard of Missouri. They had not been mustered into the service of the United States, but were in the War Department, and the same were not in the War Department, or elsewhere in Washington, any evidence of the number of men in the various classes of men had been cut out, and the same were to be determined as the case arises.

Mr. Garfield opposed the bill, and said that it would be better to appoint a commission to ascertain the amount of the claims of all the States, and then have them up piecemeal, and in future to make an appropriation for their payment.

Mr. H. B. Smith, a member of a committee on a commission to the State Guard of Missouri. They had not been mustered into the service of the United States, but were in the War Department, and the same were not in the War Department, or elsewhere in Washington, any evidence of the number of men in the various classes of men had been cut out, and the same were to be determined as the case arises.

Mr. Garfield opposed the bill, and said that it would be better to appoint a commission to ascertain the amount of the claims of all the States, and then have them up piecemeal, and in future to make an appropriation for their payment.

Mr. H. B. Smith, a member of a committee on a commission to the State Guard of Missouri. They had not been mustered into the service of the United States, but were in the War Department, and the same were not in the War Department, or elsewhere in Washington, any evidence of the number of men in the various classes of men had been cut out, and the same were to be determined as the case arises.

Mr. Garfield opposed the bill, and said that it would be better to appoint a commission to ascertain the amount of the claims of all the States, and then have them up piecemeal, and in future to make an appropriation for their payment.

Mr. H. B. Smith, a member of a committee on a commission to the State Guard of Missouri. They had not been mustered into the service of the United States, but were in the War Department, and the same were not in the War Department, or elsewhere in Washington, any evidence of the number of men in the various classes of men had been cut out, and the same were to be determined as the case arises.

Mr. Garfield opposed the bill, and said that it would be better to appoint a commission to ascertain the amount of the claims of all the States, and then have them up piecemeal, and in future to make an appropriation for their payment.

Mr. H. B. Smith, a member of a committee on a commission to the State Guard of Missouri. They had not been mustered into the service of the United States, but were in the War Department, and the same were not in the War Department, or elsewhere in Washington, any evidence of the number of men in the various classes of men had been cut out, and the same were to be determined as the case arises.

Mr. Garfield opposed the bill, and said that it would be better to appoint a commission to ascertain the amount of the claims of all the States, and then have them up piecemeal, and in future to make an appropriation for their payment.

Mr. H. B. Smith, a member of a committee on a commission to the State Guard of Missouri. They had not been mustered into the service of the United States, but were in the War Department, and the same were not in the War Department, or elsewhere in Washington, any evidence of the number of men in the various classes of men had been cut out, and the same were to be determined as the case arises.

Mr. Garfield opposed the bill, and said that it would be better to appoint a commission to ascertain the amount of the claims of all the States, and then have them up piecemeal, and in future to make an appropriation for their payment.

Mr. H. B. Smith, a member of a committee on a commission to the State Guard of Missouri. They had not been mustered into the service of the United States, but were in the War Department, and the same were not in the War Department, or elsewhere in Washington, any evidence of the number of men in the various classes of men had been cut out, and the same were to be determined as the case arises.

Mr. Garfield opposed the bill, and said that it would be better to appoint a commission to ascertain the amount of the claims of all the States, and then have them up piecemeal, and in future to make an appropriation for their payment.

Mr. H. B. Smith, a member of a committee on a commission to the State Guard of Missouri. They had not been mustered into the service of the United States, but were in the War Department, and the same were not in the War Department, or elsewhere in Washington, any evidence of the number of men in the various classes of men had been cut out, and the same were to be determined as the case arises.

Mr. Garfield opposed the bill, and said that it would be better to appoint a commission to ascertain the amount of the claims of all the States, and then have them up piecemeal, and in future to make an appropriation for their payment.

Mr. H. B. Smith, a member of a committee on a commission to the State Guard of Missouri. They had not been mustered into the service of the United States, but were in the War Department, and the same were not in the War Department, or elsewhere in Washington, any evidence of the number of men in the various classes of men had been cut out, and the same were to be determined as the case arises.

Mr. Garfield opposed the bill, and said that it would be better to appoint a commission to ascertain the amount of the claims of all the States, and then have them up piecemeal, and in future to make an appropriation for their payment.

Mr. H. B. Smith, a member of a committee on a commission to the State Guard of Missouri. They had not been mustered into the service of the United States, but were in the War Department, and the same were not in the War Department, or elsewhere in Washington, any evidence of the number of men in the various classes of men had been cut out, and the same were to be determined as the case arises.

Mr. Garfield opposed the bill, and said that it would be better to appoint a commission to ascertain the amount of the claims of all the States, and then have them up piecemeal, and in future to make an appropriation for their payment.

Mr. H. B. Smith, a member of a committee on a commission to the State Guard of Missouri. They had not been mustered into the service of the United States, but were in the War Department, and the same were not in the War Department, or elsewhere in Washington, any evidence of the number of men in the various classes of men had been cut out, and the same were to be determined as the case arises.

Mr. Garfield opposed the bill, and said that it would be better to appoint a commission to ascertain the amount of the claims of all the States, and then have them up piecemeal, and in future to make an appropriation for their payment.

Mr. H. B. Smith, a member of a committee on a commission to the State Guard of Missouri. They had not been mustered into the service of the United States, but were in the War Department, and the same were not in the War Department, or elsewhere in Washington, any evidence of the number of men in the various classes of men had been cut out, and the same were to be determined as the case arises.

Mr. Garfield opposed the bill, and said that it would be better to appoint a commission to ascertain the amount of the claims of all the States, and then have them up piecemeal, and in future to make an appropriation for their payment.

Mr. H. B. Smith, a member of a committee on a commission to the State Guard of Missouri. They had not been mustered into the service of the United States, but were in the War Department, and the same were not in the War Department, or elsewhere in Washington, any evidence of the number of men in the various classes of men had been cut out, and the same were to be determined as the case arises.

Mr. Garfield opposed the bill, and said that it would be better to appoint a commission to ascertain the amount of the claims of all the States, and then have them up piecemeal, and in future to make an appropriation for their payment.

Mr. H. B. Smith, a member of a committee on a commission to the State Guard of Missouri. They had not been mustered into the service of the United States, but were in the War Department, and the same were not in the War Department, or elsewhere in Washington, any evidence of the number of men in the various classes of men had been cut out, and the same were to be determined as the case arises.

Mr. Garfield opposed the bill, and said that it would be better to appoint a commission to ascertain the amount of the claims of all the States, and then have them up piecemeal, and in future to make an appropriation for their payment.

Mr. H. B. Smith, a member of a committee on a commission to the State Guard of Missouri. They had not been mustered into the service of the United States, but were in the War Department, and the same were not in the War Department, or elsewhere in Washington, any evidence of the number of men in the various classes of men had been cut out, and the same were to be determined as the case arises.

Mr. Garfield opposed the bill, and said that it would be better to appoint a commission to ascertain the amount of the claims of all the States, and then have them up piecemeal, and in future to make an appropriation for their payment.

Mr. H. B. Smith, a member of a committee on a commission to the State Guard of Missouri. They had not been mustered into the service of the United States, but were in the War Department, and the same were not in the War Department, or elsewhere in Washington, any evidence of the number of men in the various classes of men had been cut out, and the same were to be determined as the case arises.

Mr. Garfield opposed the bill, and said that it would be better to appoint a commission to ascertain the amount of the claims of all the States, and then have them up piecemeal, and in future to make an appropriation for their payment.

Mr. H. B. Smith, a member of a committee on a commission to the State Guard of Missouri. They had not been mustered into the service of the United States, but were in the War Department, and the same were not in the War Department, or elsewhere in Washington, any evidence of the number of men in the various classes of men had been cut out, and the same were to be determined as the case arises.

Mr. Garfield opposed the bill, and said that it would be better to appoint a commission to ascertain the amount of the claims of all the States, and then have them up piecemeal, and in future to make an appropriation for their payment.

Mr. H. B. Smith, a member of a committee on a commission to the State Guard of Missouri. They had not been mustered into the service of the United States, but were in the War Department, and the same were not in the War Department, or elsewhere in Washington, any evidence of the number of men in the various classes of men had been cut out, and the same were to be determined as the case arises.

Mr. Garfield opposed the bill, and said that it would be better to appoint a commission to ascertain the amount of the claims of all the States, and then have them up piecemeal, and in future to make an appropriation for their payment.

Mr. H. B. Smith, a member of a committee on a commission to the State Guard of Missouri. They had not been mustered into the service of the United States, but were in the War Department, and the same were not in the War Department, or elsewhere in Washington, any evidence of the number of men in the various classes of men had been cut out, and the same were to be determined as the case arises.

Mr. Garfield opposed the bill, and said that it would be better to appoint a commission to ascertain the amount of the claims of all the States, and then have them up piecemeal, and in future to make an appropriation for their payment.

Mr. H. B. Smith, a member of a committee on a commission to the State Guard of Missouri. They had not been mustered into the service of the United

